



is not a modeling of how the airplane wing material would wrap around the exterior columns as he claims. It is a photo of a laboratory demonstration of a phenomenon called "concertina tearing" seen in a metal sheet cut by a blunt object. The black line figure represents the blunt object in the test, not a exterior WTC column. The MIT study mentions that lower velocity impacts (like car crash tests) are characterized by deformation or bending of material while higher velocity impacts have fracturing as well. The above image only shows deformation, but the MIT study states that the collision of 767 and WTC is a "problem of interactive failure and fragmentation of two deformable and fracturing bodies." The study actually does not specify the exact behavior of the wing segments hitting the exterior columns, but we already know from the real-life Sandia test the very large amount of fracturing that happens in a collision of this sort. The outer parts of the wings that hit the columns would not have remained in large pieces that wrapped around the columns, but instead would have been fractured into small pieces. The segments of the wing over the windows would have continued into the building. The wing material left outside would fall to the ground as small particles.

To put it another way: Technically, it was not the hardness or thickness of the concrete block that caused the complete pulverization of the airplane in the Sandia test. The kinetic energy of the plane itself caused the disintegration (and certainly some heat energy as well). The cement block merely facilitated that conversion of kinetic energy. Any object that could stop the forward motion of a plane (or part of a plane) moving at that speed would cause the same amount of fracturing. The outer wall columns of the WTC completely stopped the forward progress of the outer half of the wings. Thus, the wings were pulverized. The concrete floors would have had a similar effect on any parts of the airplane whose forward motion was halted. Thus, the videos of the second impact are *totally* realistic and are simply a verification of the results of the Sandia test. Those who have denounced them as showing impossible "melting planes" are simply displaying a lack of understanding of physics.

Reynolds goes on to argue that the shock of impact should have caused the wings to break off and move forward. The study he cites is a simulation of a 747 whose forward progress comes to a complete stop. Obviously, the mere 12% reduction in speed of the 767 on penetrating the outside of the building was not sufficient to make this happen.

More detailed analysis of the physics and material science involved would have to be done by someone with more knowledge than Reynolds, but it should be clear at this point that Reynolds' core arguments fall apart merely by the application of elementary principles and existing test results.

Near the end of the article, Reynolds cites a series of alleged anomalies in the images of the impact that supposedly indicate fakery. As shown above, I've already addressed the majority of these "anomalies" and they turned out to be amateurish misrepresentations of normal video phenomena.

Reynolds says: "Sorting out theories of 'what really happened' awaits another day..." No doubt he wants to put off explaining the impossible: how the perps of 9/11 could have controlled all the cameras present on 9/11.

Unfortunately, Reynolds' contribution to 9/11 truth effectively functions as a Trojan horse, sandwiching bogus no-plane theories between more reputable data, like the tower demolitions. Undoubtedly, the black ops behind 9/11 must be pleased when Reynolds promotes the no-plane theories on national TV.

767 Debris

Wheels, engine parts, a piece of a fuselage and other 767 debris were found in and around the WTC. The argument that there is not enough wreckage to account for a 767 crash is purely speculative: We don't know how much plane debris was recovered from the rubble of the WTC. The government refuses to allow independent access to all the debris collected, and they may even be deliberately withholding evidence to create suspicions and encourage no-plane claims.

Movement of WTC2

Image analysis of the Scott Meyers footage of the second impact in the NIST report shows that the entire south tower swayed back forth in an oscillating motion for at least 4 minutes after the impact, something that certainly couldn't have been caused by explosiv inside the building and presumably not by the impact of a relatively small-mass object like a missile.

Radar Data

With the combination of the civilian and military radar recordings from 9/11, either the transponder or primary radar returns from flight 11 and 175 were recorded for the entirety of those flights, according to documents recently released by the NTSB which show both complete flight path and the altitude profiles of each flight. It doesn't appear that either plane was missed by primary radar for any significant length of time during the flights.

If the data presented is authentic, two things are clear: The flights started and ended where they were claimed by the official report and the altitude profiles show that neither plane was anywhere close to the ground except at takeoff and the termination of flight at Manhattan, which would rule out substitution scenarios involving landing at some other unknown airport along the flight path.

It is true that the civilian flight controllers lost track of flight 11, but it seems this happened for the following reason: civilian radar apparently did not have full primary radar return coverage, so flight 11 would have disappeared from their scopes (because the transponder was turned off) and would have been difficult to re-identify when it reappeared later without the transponder signals (which broadcast the identity of the flights). But this loss of identification does not support plane swapping. The entirety of the plane's flight path has been plotted with the recorded radar data, eliminating the possibility that the plane deviated from the course described in official reports. Whether a plane swap was achieved by two planes coming close together and switching flight paths is something that cannot be discerned from the data available and will always be nothing more than speculation unless someone can get access to the original radar data recordings and demonstrate through expert analysis that the data supports this possibility.

The burden of proof now lies on those who wish to support plane substitution to prove that the information provided by the NTSB is inaccurate.

Was the Second Plane a 737?

Jon Carlson and others have claimed that the second plane to hit the WTC was in fact a 737. This claim is easily dismissed. The jet that hit WTC2 was much too large to be a 737. 737s have a much narrower fuselage than 767s, and a 737 that has the same proportion of fuselage length and width to wingspan size as a 767-200 would be much smaller than the plane seen in the images. Additionally, 7 engines are mounted flush with the wings and are closer to the fuselage than they are on 767s. Several images of the WTC2 hit show a plane with engines that hang below the wing and which are mounted farther apart than 737 engines. Additionally, 737s do not fit through the entry holes: even the largest 737 model has a wingspan that is about 40 feet too short.

This claim is also poorly considered. Making measurements of the size and proportion of the plane in the videos is extremely easy and would invariably and inevitably expose the identity of a 737. The perps of 9/11 would never have made this substitution unless they deliberately intended to blow their cover.

The Flashes

The flashes that occur at the beginning of both impacts have been the object of much speculation. While it is difficult to say exactly what the flashes are—and this is not my area of expertise—it is easy to say what they are not. There are no missiles visible in any of the pieces of footage. The flashes appear and disappear within 1/30th of a second in both collisions, ruling out some kind of missile exhaust or explosion. The flashes do not seem to cause damage to the building, apparently contradicting the claim that the flashes were the result of some destructive weapon used to clear the way for the penetration of the planes.

The flash at the collision of flight 11 and WTC1 did not happen before impact, as some claim. The nose of the plane was almost touching the building in the frame (field, actually) before the flash making it a certainty that in the next frame showing the flash continuing was occurring. Additionally, the claim made in the "In Plane Site" video that the flash in the second hit is separated from the fuselage is not reliable. The appearance of a space in between is probably a result of the shadow of the building on the plane.

Eyewitness Testimony

Since we have so many good images of the second hit, and because physical evidence is profoundly more reliable than witness testimony, investigations into this aspect of the case are largely irrelevant. The only potentially meaningful study of eyewitnesses would be a survey of a substantial number of the witnesses who were observing the tower at the time of impact. And it's very easy to surr

that the number of witnesses should be, at the very least, in the thousands, and more probably in the tens of thousands due to the attention the smoking north tower was receiving from a city of millions and the vast number of potential vantage points with a view of the second plane's trajectory. A study with a large sample would minimize the influence of either planted testimony or erroneous reports.

What we do know of eyewitness testimony so far supports the scenario of 767s hitting the towers. In addition to accounts from civilians like Evan Fairbanks, the oral histories released by the New York Times show that at least 50 FDNY firemen saw planes or plane debris in the streets. The no-planer treatment of eyewitnesses is as weak as their physical evidence analysis. The second plane was not visible from some vantage points because downtown buildings or the WTC themselves were in the way. Therefore, some people did not see the explosion. Not surprisingly, the no-planers have tried to present these accounts as no-plane testimony. Morgan Reynolds on MSNBC that he doesn't "believe anyone in Lower Manhattan" and implies that anyone who saw a plane was an actor on the government payroll.

The "Pod"

Not precisely a no-plane argument, the claim that a pod was attached to the bottom of the second 767 turns out to be a optical illusion caused by natural lighting phenomenon. This should not be surprising, given that there are no missiles observed emerging from the pod, and that no other useful purpose seems to be accomplished by the pod. Markus Icke's attempt to affirm the reality of the pod is in part on shadows he drew in himself on his 3D images of a 767, an analysis that can fairly be called fraudulent.

Windshield UFOs

Just for fun: the latest absurd analysis to be circulated by Webfairy, Nico Haupt and others concerns an alleged UFO hovering around the north tower after the first hit. The UFO turns out to be a bit of dirt on the window of vehicle in which the film crew was travelling. It is typical of the wildly erroneous and often humorous analyses of visual evidence that we've seen so far.

The Database Errors

Perhaps the only interesting bit of data that has come from the no-planers has been the discrepancies in the BTS database involving the airline flights involved in 9/11. The problem with this evidence is that databases can be hacked, as any computer programmer can tell you. This evidence can't be regarded as reliable, let alone unimpeachable. That anyone would make it a centerpiece of an investigation is baffling. And even if the database anomalies were reliable, it would only establish the possibility of plane substitution and would shed no light at all on what type of plane actually hit the North tower.

It is standard operating procedure for false and misleading evidence to be planted to discredit conspiracy researchers. We can be nearly certain that this has been done with 9/11 evidence and these database errors are a leading candidate for suspicion.

Still, there is documentary evidence for at least the idea of flight substitution in the Operation Northwoods documents, which call for substitution of a chartered airline flight to be substituted with a drone. This drone was to be shot down and the downing of the plane blamed on Cuba. What has seemingly been lost on the 9/11 plane substitution advocates is that the Northwoods plans called for substitution because this was to be a fake plane flight to begin with, a charter full of intelligence assets who would be quietly and secretly disembarked later. The whole point of substitution was to avoid real casualties. The perpetrators of 9/11 obviously did not care about casualties so why would substitution be necessary? In a substitution scenario they would need to divert the original flights logically they would have had full control over those planes. There was no technical obstacle to flying the planes into the towers, so if they had control why didn't they do that and avoid all the risks? And it should be noted that Operation Northwoods calls for the drone to be a copy of the airliner, not a missile or smaller aircraft, even despite the fact that it was not going to be flown over a populated city whose attention-and cameras-were riveted on the target. To suggest that the perps of 9/11, with the resources at their disposal, would have taken the risk of using an airplane other than a 767 is nonsensical.

Do Anomalies Constitute Proof of No-767 Hypotheses?

The possibility that anomalies that defy easy explanation might exist in the visual record must be considered when analyzing the no-plane hypothesis. It may very well be that the explanation of some alleged anomalies might require a level of technical capacity far beyond any researchers in the 9/11 movement now dealing with this issue. For example, a professional 3D modeling of the plane's approach to the WTC with photo-realistic lighting combined with simulation of physics properties such as momentum or aerodynamics and using research into the exact location and lens type of the camera in question might be needed. But even if a confirmed anomaly in the visual record were someday found, it would not constitute proof that no 767s hit the towers: It would prove only that that particular video was faked, and the perpetrators of 9/11 could have distributed faked videos to encourage the no-plane hypothesis. Given that the perps couldn't have controlled all the cameras in New York on 9/11, and that absolutely no images showing something other than the impacts have surfaced, it is arguable that anomalous videos shouldn't even be considered compelling evidence, let alone proof, of no-767 claims.

Conclusion

There are many solid pieces of visual evidence—video recordings and photos—that show 767's impacting the World Trade Center towers. If only one of these images is authentic, the entire no-plane hypothesis is invalidated. There are absolutely no images of anything else hitting the towers despite the attention the burning WTC1 tower was receiving from a city of millions. The attempts by no-planers to create credibility for their hypothesis by citing purported anomalies in the visual record have been characterized by a degree of technical incompetence and illogical thinking. Because an authentic visual anomaly would only prove that that particular image was faked, and would not prove that something besides 767s hit the towers, it is clear that there is no supporting physical evidence whatsoever for the no-plane hypothesis.

Commentary

When I told friends who were open to 9/11 skepticism that I was working on some articles critical of these no-plane theories, they looked at me askance, as if to say "why are you even wasting your time on that?" Overall their reaction was appropriate. Frankly, I've been embarrassed to admit to ordinary folks that I've been working on these articles and have begrudged every moment of time I've spent on it. These theories never were and never will be broadly accepted among the 9/11 skeptic community, let alone the broader public even with the attention of high profile figures like Morgan Reynolds or Jimmy Walter. But that doesn't mean that they are not a threat especially to a particular minority segment of the 9/11 skeptics community.

The treatment of the pod issue by Popular Mechanics should be a warning.

The pod theory was never supported by any more than a small minority of 9/11 researchers. But as a result of Von Kleist's error-ridden "In Plane Site" DVD and forwarding of pod articles by naive individuals who thought they were encouraging dialogue, enough noise built up around the issue to give PM the justification to portray the "pod" as a widely-held view. And their treatment of it was a mast stroke. They gave it marquee position at the beginning of the article: a first impression tainting all the other stronger evidence to follow. And then their debunking was weak, simply a one-liner from an expert claiming it was an illusion, allowing the pod advocates to declare victory and continue to push their theory. Overall, a lose-lose scenario for 9/11 truth.

One has to wonder, with the no-plane theories gaining the support of big shots Morgan Reynolds and Jimmy Walter, if a repeat of the pod debacle is in the cards.

If so, there are many reasons why it has progressed to this point. The phrase "Fools Rush In" has never been so appropriate than describing the rougher edges of the 9/11 truth movement, in which we've seen all sorts of instant experts talking about technical subjects far removed from their expertise. Some researchers who are quite good at tracking down information have proven themselves completely incompetent at making a sound technical analysis. It's a completely different skill set.

The no-plane ideas are a manifestation of an epidemic of "smoking gun fever," the rush to see promising evidence in any and every perceived anomaly. One could chalk this up to technical incompetence, reckless enthusiasm, or a desperate desire for ammunition to use against a terrifying conspiracy, but the problem is deeper. It is often driven by a partisan imperative to pursue a more radical case. And by radical I don't mean "leftist" but simply more divergent from the official story. If you look at the rhetoric of a no-plane supporter such as Nico Haupt, you see an attempt to make accepting no-plane claims synonymous with pursuing the "real truth." Likewise, the "Gatekeepers" research of Bob Feldman (for which I helped build the flowchart graphic) has been hijacked and transformed from a complex analysis of elite control of lefty media into a simplistic ideological litmus test: "If you don't support my spurious physical evidence claims you're a 'gatekeeper.'"

The discussion of physical evidence has been politicized, subject to the old and tiresome radical-moderate dialectic. I worry that the 9/11 truth movement is devolving towards a predictable, manufactured divide: moderates who treat physical evidence responsibly and who advocate limited-hangout analyses of both 9/11 and world politics, and radicals who pursue a deeper and more accurate overall analysis but who lunge after spurious and sensational physical evidence claims in the name of exposing a deeper truth. For example, you can find Haupt questioning the "peak oil" theory one minute and posting the windshield UFO garbage the next. That behavior discredits those who are pursuing more radical analyses.

Discussion of physical evidence should be egoless and non-ideological, characterized by stark realism. First the evidence has to be demonstrated simply to be reliable. Then it must be decided whether there is enough evidence to make a convincing case. The no-plane theories don't even make it past the first test. Every day prosecutors drop charges in criminal cases because they don't have enough evidence to go to trial, and they may do this even though they know the suspect is guilty as sin. Why? You pick your battle.

carefully, pick those you can win. In the end, *the physical evidence may only support a limited hangout*. If that is the case the answer is not to give up and go home but to augment the physical evidence with research about the past history of elite manipulation. Despite some forays into questionable evidence, Webster Tarpley has done exactly this in his book "9/11 Synthetic Terror."

On the other hand, massaging the evidence to fit a more radical analysis is exactly what the perps of 9/11 want: It leads to straw man arguments that the debunkers can knock down.

It should go without saying that an investigation of a conspiracy like 9/11 will always be a two-front war against disinformation: On one side are the gatekeepers pursuing a limited hangout. On the other side are crackpots and disinfo agents pushing bogus, discrediting evidence. Weeding out bogus claims is neither gatekeeping nor censorship but an absolutely critical activity. In defending no-plane and pod people, some who don't even support the theories have cited "freedom of speech" in defending those theories' place at the table, evidently feeling that if there is any tendency to reject any lines of inquiry, then there will not be an atmosphere conducive to uncovering the full truth. This attitude simply ignores one front of the two-front war we're involved with. The treatment of the "pod" issue by PM is a perfect example of how this "freedom of speech" argument can backfire. It's clear the advocates of certain theories have shown themselves to be completely egotistically and ideologically attached to those theories. They'll never change. So if this breakthrough and embarrasses us like the pod issue did, the real responsibility will be with those who kept forwarding or tolerating the no-plane material in the interest of "dialogue" or "exploration" or "askin' questions" and who failed to use their powers of discernment to see through a baseless argument.

In between the two fronts of this information war there is a lot of grey area, with quite a bit of room for principled disagreement about both evidence and tactics. Of course, principled disagreement is exactly the opposite of the obnoxious behavior of the no-planers, of which I've documented in my articles, and which has included aggressive bluffing, bald-faced denials of obvious mistakes and personal attacks upon critics of the theories. This behavior creates an acrimonious and divisive atmosphere in a movement that prevents productive work, and is usually the MO of deep cover agents. But I'm not suggesting no-plane advocates are agents. I do believe that most are deluded "useful idiots," as the terminology goes. As such, their offerings are misinformation, not disinformation. But that doesn't mean that the spooks wouldn't flood lists and forums with vociferous multiple-pseudonym supporters of these theories in a tactic similar to the astroturfing of mainstream politics. If I were in charge of the cover up I would let the authentic fools emerge then use mind control to encourage egomaniacal, narcissistic, and aggressive tendencies. But while general comments on what theories constitute disinfo are reasonable, it's useless to let fly specific accusations of disinfo activity regarding individuals. There is never any evidence. Charges going back and forth is what the cover-up crew wants: Divide and conquer. And given the historical record of COINTELPRO, the ones making the accusations are most likely to actually be the agents.

Of course, the no-planers have been constantly accusing other activists of being agents, always without proof and based on the meagreness of reasoning. Simply working at a university that received government funding is cause for suspicion in their eyes. Imagine what they would say if a 9-11 activist used to work for the Bush administration itself. They would go ape, slandering that activist incessantly, accusing them of posing as a defector to be able to encourage the most unproductive areas of 9-11 research. But wait forgot: Morgan Reynolds IS from the Bush administration. But, of course, for the no-planers he's completely above suspicion because he supports their arguments. Just goes to show the incredibly biased thinking going on in those quarters.

If this is a disinfo operation we can expect that more "defectors" from high places will come forward to support it. The ongoing strategy will not be to win over the entire 9/11 truth movement, but simply to establish the legitimacy of investigating it so that people like Mr. Reynolds or Jimmy Walter will have just enough political support to give the impression to the general public that this is a key issue in 9/11 research. Therefore, the action for 9/11 activists to take now is not just to oppose the no-plane garbage but to shun the figures who promote it. After all, the success of the Loose Change DVD showed us (despite its flaws) that you don't need to be famous or to have a profound influence. We don't need standard bearers who push discrediting ideas, no matter how fortuitous their support seems.

Eric Salter has more than a decade of professional video experience, which has included editing, 3D animation, compositing, motion graphics, image retouching, and camera operation.

Update, 31 October 2005

Here are a few comments in response to Nico Haupt's analysis of this article. [This discussion refers to the original version of this article, which did not acknowledge that the hologram theory had been abandoned]

First of all, Haupt brazenly mischaracterizes my article as a critique of "activism" when in fact it is a technical rebuttal of blatantly false no-767 theories and an analysis of the pathological and technically incompetent thinking that led to those mistakes. It's regrettable Haupt was not able to accurately describe the current thinking of ex-hologram theorists, but that really doesn't matter. The misinterpretations of visual anomalies are the same whether they are used to support hologram or TV fakery theories. Thus the substance of my visual analysis is germane to both theories and doesn't need to be revisited.

As a matter of fact I'm absolutely delighted that the non-falsifiable, sci-fi hologram theory has been abandoned in favor of the TV fakery theory. As I pointed out, you don't even need to consider the visual evidence to dismiss this theory: it is so utterly impossible. It falls apart on logic and common sense alone. It just might be the worst conspiracy theory in the history of conspiracy theory. Given this, really could and perhaps should end my arguments about the no-767 theories right here, forever, and move on to other things. But a few more comments on Haupt's analysis will confirm the pathology I talked about in my commentary.

Haupt attempts to evade responsibility for his embarrassing advocacy of fanciful interpretations of a spot of dirt on a windshield by complaining that I used the term "UFO" instead of "whatzit". As if using the term "whatzit" makes the analysis of a spot of dirt credible. Then he complains about the 13 helicopters that I don't explain. This is a common game that is played by this crowd: bringing up a "new" smoking gun that I haven't covered that supposedly PROVES something was amiss. So let's talk about the helicopters.

Just what would the perpetrators of 9/11 be doing with a fleet of 13 helicopters? Nothing I can think of, at least nothing that couldn't be better accomplished from a discrete, hidden location. Were they trying to advertise that this was a staged event? What really were these helicopters? Obviously, the gathering of news, police, fire, and medical helicopters that you would expect, and that would have had the time to gather by the time of the collapses. Haupt's bug-eyed insinuation of something fishy going on is a perfect example of the utterly idiotic, discrediting, crackpot interpretations of ordinary phenomena, driven by "smoking gun fever," that I alluded to in my article.

The public has a well-conditioned impression, created by official disinformation machine, that conspiracy theorists are half-mad, technically incompetent fools who see extraordinary conspiracies in ordinary events. The presumptuous sloppiness of Haupt and company feeds right into this perception, just one of the ways they are helping the fascist perps they claim to be fighting. Inside the 9/11 truth movement, their behavior lends moral authority to those pursuing limited hangouts by making more radical interpretations look ridiculous.

Haupt's claim that there is "one" official live footage of the crash of the second plane is false. I have digitized a videotape of the live broadcast of channel 11 in New York which shows a shot from their news copter that I have never seen before. Once I get an internet connection in my new home in exile in the Andes, I'll post it. This piece of footage cuts to the heart of the absurd argument that the perps could have had control over ALL the live and taped footage of the foreign and domestic networks, the local affiliates, the independent videographers and the ordinary people who had their cameras running.

Update 2, 7 Nov. 2005

WTC impact footage from WNYW



The following is a segment from the live broadcast of Channel 11 in New York which captures the live impact of flight 175 into WTC2. It was taken from the helicopter of WNYW, Channel 5. The signal temporarily goes to black just after the impact, most likely a switching error at one of the two stations.

FULL SEGMENT (16 seconds, 988Kb quicktime .mov, 320x240)

HI-RESOLUTION EXCERPT (1.5 seconds, 1Mb quicktime .mov, 640x480)

It undercuts Nico Haupt's dramatic claim that there was only one "official" live feed of the impact, the long shot of the skyscrapers on CNN. It turns out the basis for Haupt's claim was only his memory, which gives you a good idea of his shoddy standards for evidence. The presence of this footage also underscores the impossibility of controlling all the media in New York on 9/11 and overlaying fake video. Not only were the major broadcast and cable networks present, but also the local network affiliates which have their own news gathering capabilities and are often locally owned (they will sometimes change network affiliation). In addition were the local independent stations, also commonly possessing news gathering capability, including helicopters. The TV fakery requires that technical employees (engineers, camera operators, switchers, directors, etc.) were all agents who actively participated in the crime of 9/11. This is asinine. There are thousands of such persons for whom this is simply a career and are constantly cycling through employment with the networks. While there are certainly plenty of government (and shadow government) moles in the media, no serious researchers have ever concluded that they are controlled outright, to the extent of participating in something like the 9/11 attack. That's bug-eyed crackpot territory: "THEY control the media!" For the most part, the control of the media is accomplished through more subtle means, including policy directives from management, reliance on government and foundation reports, self-censorship from fear of losing one's job, peer pressure, and the same mental conditioning to which most of the rest of society has been subjected. Even if you had a core group of agents in technical positions the probability of their activities being detected by non-agent employees would be extremely high and this security risk would be duplicated at every network and local station. Factor in all the independent professionals and amateurs with cameras in the streets and it's obvious that the TV fakery is a complete joke, especially when one considers that there were no obstacles to flying the original 767s into the towers and avoiding all this insane risk.

However, it must be said that it would be quite easy for the perps of 9/11 to sneak into circulation some faked pieces of footage in order to encourage no-plane theories. After all, given the irrational mind-state of the no-planers, it would only take one fake to convince them that all were faked.

[End of update 2; update 1 continues...]

The one single complaint Haupt makes which I find reasonable is that I didn't make a strong enough distinction between the no-pla and the substitute 767 theories. Of course the latter is at least possible, and I have carefully made a point to acknowledge this spe possibility in the past, but the fact remains that the evidence we've seen so far is either inconclusive (the departure gate confusion) totally unreliable (the eminently hackable flight database). Because of the weak evidence, no one deserves to be castigated as an obfuscator or "official story supporter" for finding this theory lacking, yet Haupt and crew have consistently made these kinds of unjustifiably divisive and acrimonious accusations over this issue all the time.

This line of Haupt's takes the cake: "Salter seems to be not concerned about the political situation worldwide and appears like a we earning digital coach potato." This is the usual ad hominem attack that the no-planers resort to when their "analysis" fails to convin. Of course, any reasonable person can see the huge amount of work and care that went into my article. I must add that I have chroi disabling back pain as a result of scoliosis and thoracic outlet syndrome, as well as the lingering side effects of four major surgerie: attempting treatment, all of them failures. It happens that 7 or 8 years ago I couldn't even sit on a couch to watch TV. Even now, sit down for hours at my computer to hash through crackpot crap is a big sacrifice for me. As for "well earning," I have to admit that I a the government payroll! In a sense... I receive a pittance from the Social Security Disability Insurance for my health problems, an amount that didn't even pay my rent when I lived in San Francisco. Luckily, it's just enough for me to live on in a poor, developing country.

I suppose, however, that Haupt should recruit Gerard Holmgren to invent some fanciful, imaginary reasons why that disability pens indicates I'm an agent.

This article, and my previous critiques, were not enjoyable for me, and are not the kind of thing that I would desire to do. I wrote the simply because I felt it was necessary, and because of my background and training this was an area where I was particularly qualifi to make a helpful contribution to 9/11 research and activism. Some fellow activists who agree with my positions have nonetheless argued that I have spent too much energy on a "fringe" element, and that I was drawing too much attention to a divisive distraction they felt would quickly become a forgotten flash-in-the-pan. Unfortunately, I think that the way things have played out over the past year, particularly considering the recent example of Morgan Reynolds, shows that I was right. That said, all the time I was spending this article I was grumbling to myself about what I would really like to be researching:

- government suppression of free energy and antigravity technology.
- elite sponsored new age cults
- the history of elite Malthusian agendas and the NWO "B-team" of "earth-friendly" movements

- the 'peak oil' scam, and many other subjects.

Haupt will recognize the above issues. He's helping to discredit and reverse the difficult, hard-won progress of more thoughtful and responsible researchers on these issues by constantly mentioning them in the same breath as the no-plane garbage.

That's all I have to say. At this point, since the self-evidently moronic TV fakery theory is the remaining area of inquiry, I can permanently wash my hands of the no-plane issue, and focus instead on confronting the fascist perps of 9/11 and the NWO directly, instead of the intellectually debauched fools who are inadvertently helping them.

Eric Salter